

### **REMARKS**

The Declaration was objected to because it lacked Todd Fischer's address. A new Declaration is submitted by Todd Fischer. The mailing address is included on the Declaration. This is believed to render moot the objection.

The examiner objected to the abstract because of the computer document path included on it. The computer document path is deleted by an amendment to the abstract.

Claims 24-25 and 28-30 were objected to because of typographical errors. The examiner's assumption about the dependencies of the claims was correct. However, these claims have been canceled. The objection is rendered moot.

There was a 112 rejection of claims 1-39. It is submitted that an objection might have been more appropriate in this case, as the claims appear to have been understood and minor informalities not affecting understanding are easily corrected.

Regarding claims 1 and 23, antecedent basis has been added for "the computer". Claim 23 has been directly amended. Claim 1 has been canceled, but where it has been incorporated into dependent claims now rewritten in independent form, antecedent basis is provided for "the computer". This is believed to address the rejection.

The examiner objected to claims 26 and 37 as saying that "the portable wireless device" lacks antecedent basis. This is not understood. Regarding claim 37, which is still pending, the portable wireless device is explicitly recited in the preamble. This is an appropriate antecedent reference. If the examiner maintains the rejection with respect to claim 37, further explanation is respectfully requested.

The examiner rejected claim 21. The examiner's assumption concerning the printing of print content was correct. The invention does not exclude the printing of the reference along with the content, however. This is noted for the record. Nonetheless, the intention of the claim was correctly deduced by the examiner.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 13-19, 23-31 and 35-39 stand rejected under § 102 in view of Larsson, International Publication No. WO0142894. Some of the claims have been canceled, and others have been rewritten in independent form. The rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the claims that have been rewritten in independent form.

In Claim 5 the print device supplies a reference to a print service that is adapted to retrieve the print content from the network and it is also adapted to format the retrieved print content for printing. This permits the reference to identify an adequate print service that the printer can use to resolve a print by reference operation. The print service device in Larsson's system is shown in FIG. 5 and is part of the information service providers 200 illustrated in any of the embodiments in FIGS. 1-4 of Larsson. The examiner has cited page 16 as corresponding to claim 5. Page 16 does not describe a wireless device sending reference to a printer, the reference including information allowing the print device to supply the reference to a print service to cause the print service to retrieve the print content. According to the invention, the reference can specify an appropriate print service for formatting of the content. The content and the formatting for the particular printer may not be available from the same source.

In Larsson, the print service 210 identified by the examiner are always part of the information service provider. If the information service provider lacks formatting information for the particular printer being used in a print by reference operation, that printer will not be able to be used for the presentation contemplated in Larsson's system beginning with a PDA 100. The invention in claim 5 permits the print by reference operation to address a print service and content that are in different locations. The content is retrieved and the print service is used to format the information for printing, for example.

Claim 15 has been rewritten in independent form. Claim 15 requires that the discovery signal be communicated to a print device and that a responsive signal from the print device "identifies one or more of the print capabilities of the print device." This feature was not addressed specifically in the explanation of the rejection, nor does Larsson disclose such a feature. Pages 20 and 21 of Larsson do disclose a wireless device 100 that discovers print devices 300. The print devices respond when discovery is requested. However, the print devices response does not include information about the capabilities of the printer. As an example, the response may include information about whether the device has color printing capabilities, whether print device is equipped for printing specialized graphic files and could also specify cost information if the printer is set up as a pay for print service. This is described with respect to an example embodiment on page 12 of the present application. In the case where there are multiple printers within range of a wireless device, this permits the selection of an appropriate printer by any number of capabilities that the printer might indicate in its responsive signal.

Claim 18 has also been rewritten in independent form. In claim 18 information is added to the reference before it is wirelessly communicated to a print device. The information added includes a locator that identifies the location of a print service. As discussed above with regard to claim 5, this permits the reference to identify a print service that can be used to format referenced content for printing on the particular printer being used for a print by reference operation. This will work, for example, when the content is with a source that does not provide such formatting information or the printer does not include drivers for such information. In Larsson's system, it is assumed that the information service provider has a print service that will format information for printing. That assumption greatly limits the applicability of Larsson's presentation system.

Claim 19 has also been rewritten in independent form. Claim 19 requires that the information added to the reference include a security access code. The office action discusses the specification of a transport route, but this does not correspond to a security access code being added to the reference. Applicants find no discussion of a security reference code in the reference used to initiate a print operation in Larsson. Larsson does mention on page 25 that the transfer of attachments can be done by secure channels. This does not appear to address the entitlement to particular print content and does not address a security access code in the reference.

Regarding claims 37-39, claim 37 requires that the reference identify the location of the print content be sent by the first communication interface to a print service and that the print service then retrieve the print content from a network and causes the print service to transmit the print content to the portable wireless device.

Similar to the discussion of claim 5 above, this permits the print content and print service to be in different locations. This flexible approach allows a print by reference operation to print content with a printer device whether or not the device is capable of formatting the information or whether there has been a pre-existing driver for formatting the information. It also permits the retrieval of unique content that has formatting not frequently used and for which drivers are not readily available. In contrast, the print formatting in Larsson's device is assumed to be a capability of the information service provider where the content is located. There is no disclosure of a print service obtaining print content from a network because the print service is part of the information service provider that has the print content.

Claims 4 and 20 stand rejected under Larsson in view of Saylor U.S. Patent 6,501,832. The rejection is respectfully traversed. The examiner alleges that Saylor teaches the addition of billing information to a reference. This is not supported by Saylor. Saylor does not concern print by reference operations at all. The V codes in Saylor are used to permit access. Nothing in the V codes provides billing information, instead the code merely provides an access. There is a billing module described in column 31, but it has absolutely nothing to do with a reference by which content may be printed for pay. The reference contemplated in the claims includes the billing information.

The combination is also inappropriate. Saylor is completely concerned with a voice communication system allowing access to a voice server. It has nothing to do with printing operations of any sort. It has nothing to do with presentation operations. An artisan would not have been motivated to look to modify Larsson with

the teachings of Saylor. The examiner says the motivation would be "to properly charge users for accessing the per fee content". However, Saylor does not disclose access to print content of any sort. Saylor allows certain financial transactions to be completed. The invention, in contrast, permits a charge for print content that is printed as a result of a print by reference operations.

Claim 21 stands rejected over Larsson in an official notice. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The examiner states that it is well known to practice the invention of claim 21 in view of Larsson because form feeds are well known in the art. This is not a fair interpretation of the claim or of the art. The claim requires that a reference used in a print by reference operation includes format data instructing a print device to print beginning on a new sheet. Print by reference operations are not notoriously old and well known. There is no art indicating that a reference includes any format information whatsoever of record. In Larsson's system, the formatting is handled by print services that are part of information service providers. Should the examiner maintain this rejection, it would require showing a print by reference operation including format information with a new sheet instruction. Absent a print by reference operation where the reference includes such format information, the rejection is inappropriate.

Claim 22 stands rejected in view of Larsson and Terrill under §103. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Terrill patent is not properly used as prior art against claim 21 in the §103 rejection. Its publication date is subsequent to the filing date of the instant

application. It can qualify as prior art only under §102(e). It is owned by Hewlett-Packard as is the present application. According to 35 U.S.C. §103(c), the reference cannot be used against the present application in an obviousness rejection. The merits of the rejection are also disagreed with, but need not be addressed.

Claims 9-12 and 32-34 stand rejected under § 103 in view of Larsson, Takahashi and Yoon. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Takahashi's system is a fingerprint authentication system. According to Takahashi, a computer uses fingerprints to control the access to print information. There is absolutely no discussion of a print by reference operation. There is absolutely no discussion of the wireless initiation of a print by reference operation with a print device. The combination simply does not teach the features that are in the claims. In the claims, the security access code is sent along with the reference to initiate a print operation via a wireless medium. This permits, for example, printers in commercial settings to be used by users having paid a subscription fee or otherwise paid for access, for example. It also permits, for example, employees of a company having a security access code to visit another company location and initiate a print by reference operation with a printer at the location. In the claims, the reference is sent to a print device, whereas in Takahashi there is a computer that is controlling the access. In sum, Takahashi has little to do with the particular scheme for security access that is contemplated in the print by reference operation in the claims.

Also, an artisan would not be motivated to combine Larsson with Takahashi. The user of a PDA is likely to keep the PDA on the person. The wireless device 100 in Larsson does not have the same security concerns that the personal

computer of Takahashi does. If Larsson were modified by Takahashi, the wireless device 100 in Larsson would require a fingerprint operation for access of the device. This does still not result in the claimed invention, and an artisan would not be motivated to make such a modification.

Regarding claims 11 and 34, these claims have the security access code enabling access to the print content. Yoon, on the other hand, has a particular web info shop. Yoon controls access to the web info shop and provides mechanisms for charging for use of the web info shop. In the claims, the security access code is transmitted wirelessly along with the print by reference operation. In claim 11 it enables access to print content that is at the network locations specified by the reference. Yoon, in contrast, discloses an interactive system where a response and authentication procedure are used to allow access to a web info shop service. It is not at all clear how this could be used to modify Larsson's system. It is also not at all clear what this has to do with the communication of a security code that allows access to print content that is addressed in a print by reference operation.

Generally, there is an effort in the office action to pick and choose features from a collection of unrelated patents. The multiple § 103 rejections indicate that there has been an improper reconstruction of the claimed features. The references used to modify Larsson have nothing to do with print by reference operations. The references only vaguely relate to some general billing and security issues in completely different systems. None of the references are concerned or address particular problems raised by a print by reference operation. No artisan would have been motivated to look to the different references without having the roadmap



provided by the features of the claimed invention as set forth in the present claims and application.

For all of the above reasons reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested. The rejections that were rendered moot by the cancellation of claims have not been specifically addressed. Should the examiner have any questions, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if it would help to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Steven P. Fallon

Registration No. 35,132

April 12, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\3417\65544\886518.DOC